

## NICE PUBLIC HEALTH GUIDANCE

### Overweight and Obese Adults: lifestyle weight management

#### 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the Programme Development Group

Tuesday 4<sup>th</sup> June 2013

NICE Offices, London

#### Final Minutes

<p><b>Attendees:</b></p>	<p><b><i>PDG Members</i></b>                  Gill Fine (Chair), Lucy Aphramor, Barry Attwood, Matthew Broughton, Ruth Chambers, Jane DeVille-Almond, Ulla Griffiths, Kate Jolly, Laura Sanger, Carol Weir, Sarah West Sadler</p> <p><b><i>NICE Team</i></b>                  Jane Huntley, Adrienne Cullum, Caroline Mulvihill, Alastair Fischer, Andrew Hoy, Victoria Axe</p> <p><b><i>Experts</i></b>                  Jane Ogden (University of Surrey)</p> <p><b><i>Review Team</i></b>                  Paul Aveyard (University of Oxford), Jamie Hartmann-Boyce (University of Oxford), David Johns (University of Oxford), Lise Ritat (UK Health Forum), Tim Marsh (UK Health Forum), Mark Suhrcke (University of East Anglia)</p> <p><b><i>Observer</i></b>                  Laura Gibson</p>
<p><b>Apologies:</b></p>	<p><b><i>PDG Members</i></b>                  Vicky Hobart</p> <p><b><i>Review Team</i></b>                  Martin Brown (UK Health Forum)</p>
<p><b>Author</b></p>	<p>Victoria Axe</p>
<p><b>File Ref</b></p>	<p>Final minutes of PDG 3 4<sup>th</sup> June 2013</p>
<p><b>Version</b></p>	<p>Final</p>
<p><b>Audience</b></p>	<p><b>PDG members, NICE team, the public (via web publication)</b></p>

Item		Action
<b>1. Welcome and objectives for the meeting</b>	<p>The Chair welcomed the Programme Development Group (PDG) to the third meeting on Overweight and obese adults: lifestyle weight management.</p> <p>The Chair noted that apologies had been received from Vicky Hobart.</p> <p>The Chair welcomed the observer, Laura Gibson to the meeting. The Chair also welcomed Andrew Hoy to the NICE team and noted that Nicola Ainsworth had given birth to a baby girl in May.</p> <p>The Chair informed the group that the objectives of the day would be to: hear testimony from Jane Ogden, discuss the modelling report; discuss the final review and to draft recommendations.</p>	
<b>2. Declarations of Interests</b>	<p>The Chair asked the PDG to give a verbal update of their interests and to keep their declarations updated throughout the guidance development.</p> <p>Barry Attwood had previously declared in writing that he had recently been appointed as a non-executive member of the Staffordshire and Stoke on Trent Cancer and End of Life Care Programme, which is a project managed by five local CCGs and MacMillan Cancer Care. He took up the post in May.</p> <p>Jane DeVille-Almond declared that she is attending the ADA and presenting a poster at the conference and Novo Nordisk are sponsoring her travel and hotel accommodation for the educational meeting. The poster and paper she is presenting has not been sponsored by any Pharmaceutical company and is an independent piece of research.</p> <p>There were no further interests to declare.</p>	
<b>3. Minutes and actions of the last meeting</b>	<p>The minutes of the last meeting were noted and agreed to be an accurate record.</p>	
<b>4. Expert Testimony</b>	<p>The Chair informed the group that there had been some discussion outside of the meeting, both via email and verbally, around the expert advisor, Jane Ogden, who had been asked to give a presentation in regard to weight stigma to the PDG. The discussion focused on Jane Ogden's presentation at a conference on stigma, (held in Birmingham in May). The title of Jane Ogden's presentation at that conference was 'The possible positive role of weight stigma: keeping a lid on the obesity problem'. The Chair noted that Jane Ogden</p>	

	<p>was a respected academic and had been asked to give an overview of a number of issues raised by the PDG. The Chair noted that she was grateful for the comments received from two members of the PDG expressing concern that this expert testimony was potentially inappropriate. Having discussed with NICE, it was decided that hearing all areas of evidence was important in order to encourage a robust debate.</p> <p>Lucy Aphramor (LA) expressed her strong concerns with the suggestion of the positive role of stigma. She felt that this gave the wrong message about NICE commitment to social values. She informed the group that because of this she would not attend the meeting during the presentation but would return for the discussion.</p> <p>Jane Huntley informed the PDG that there is a social values judgement paper which can be found on the website <a href="#">here</a>. It was noted that NICE is not in breach of its process. The Centre Director of Public Health at NICE had been informed of the issues and was of the opinion that the session should proceed as planned.</p> <p>Lucy Aphramor left the meeting at 10.25am.</p> <p>Jane Ogden (JO) from the University of Surrey arrived at 10.25am and the Chair introduced her to the group.</p> <p>JO had no interests to declare.</p> <p>JO gave a presentation entitled “Weight bias, stigma and the effectiveness of weight management programmes”.</p> <p>JO had previously been asked by NICE to provide testimony on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The psychological consequences of obesity management</li> <li>• The role of weight stigma</li> <li>• Maintaining weight loss</li> <li>• Psychological effects of weight cycling</li> <li>• Adverse effects of dieting</li> <li>• The role of behaviour change techniques</li> </ul> <p>The UK Health Forum team arrived at 11am.</p> <p>Lucy Aphramor returned to the meeting at 11.10am.</p> <p>The Chair invited the PDG to ask JO questions in regard to her presentation and a number of comments were raised.</p> <p>Paul Aveyard arrived at 11.25am.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>The Chair thanked JO for her presentation and gave a brief summary of the discussions.</p>	
<b>5. Health economics</b>	<p>The UK Health Forum team gave a presentation on Weight Management and Obesity in Adults.</p> <p>The Chair invited the PDG to ask questions during the presentation. A number of comments were made and further interpretation of the data was given.</p> <p>The UK Health Forum confirmed that the source of their data was systematic reviews judged to have been of high quality.</p> <p>Marc Suhrcke gave a presentation entitled “The productivity effect of obesity: a review of reviews and an update of primary studies”.</p> <p><b>Action: The UK Health Forum to consider the likely needs of commissioners in relation to any future work.</b></p> <p>The Chair invited the Oxford Team to comment on the presentation and the evidence.</p> <p>It was noted that the PDG needed to consider the maintenance of weight issue within the model, and confirm the questions the economic model would ideally answer.</p> <p>The Chair summarised the issues and suggested that the economics subgroup should meet up again as soon as possible to have a final discussion.</p> <p><b>Action: The NICE team to organise a date for the economics subgroup to meet.</b></p> <p>The UK Health Forum left the meeting at 1pm.</p>	<p><b>UK Health Forum</b></p> <p><b>AF</b></p>
<b>6. Evidence review 2: presentation of findings and discussion</b>	<p>The Oxford University Team gave a presentation on their second evidence review on managing overweight and obese adults. The Oxford Team noted that this review considered qualitative evidence.</p> <p>The Chair invited the PDG to ask questions in regard to the presentation and the second evidence review.</p> <p>Adrienne Cullum (AC) noted that some of this data has not been published therefore at the time of consultation on the guidance, if this is still academic or commercial in confidence, the evidence will need to be redacted. AC confirmed that the PDG can still use evidence from these reviews, however they must keep the data confidential.</p>	

	<p>The Chair invited the PDG to discuss other items of evidence the review team had provided, including the evidence statements.</p> <p>The PDG were asked to check that the statements reflected the evidence in the reviews and a number of amendments were suggested.</p> <p><b>Action: The Oxford Team to amend the wording of evidence statement 1.22 to note that there will be a “faster rate of weight regain” instead of “greater weight regain”.</b></p> <p><b>Action: The Oxford Team to add a footnote to evidence statement 1.13 to clarify what “contact with a dietician” actually means.</b></p> <p><b>Action: The Oxford Team to add a footnote to clarify what “completion” is.</b></p> <p>The PDG agreed that they were content with the evidence statements. The Chair thanked the Oxford Team for their work. The Oxford Team left the meeting at 2.25pm.</p>	<p>Review Team</p> <p>Review Team</p> <p>Review Team</p>
<p><b>7. Drafting recommendations</b></p>	<p>The NICE team had drafted some recommendations taken from discussions from the previous two PDG meetings. NICE had also been through the <a href="#">DH best practice guidance</a> and had flagged where there were opportunities for the guidance to add value. NICE had also been through the evidence reviews to flag any gaps in the evidence.</p> <p>The Chair asked the PDG to think about the structure and the tone of the draft recommendations. For each recommendation the PDG considered who should take action and what action they should take.</p> <p>The PDG discussed each draft recommendation and suggested a number of amendments. The PDG were reminded that all recommendations should come from evidence they had either read or heard. The Chair noted that the PDG should consider equality in all of their recommendations.</p> <p>The PDG identified a number of gaps in the evidence which included informed consent and alternatives.</p> <p><b>Action: The NICE Team to clarify the role of specialised services and clinical commissioning groups and to add health and well being boards into recommendation 3.</b></p> <p><b>Action: The NICE Team to ask the Oxford Review</b></p>	<p>The NICE Team</p> <p>The NICE</p>

	<p><b>Team whether a paper identified by Lucy Aphramor would have met the inclusion criteria for the review of effectiveness.</b></p> <p><b>Action: The NICE team to amend the draft recommendations in line with the PDG’s suggestions.</b></p> <p>There was a discussion around evaluation monitoring, for example who needed to get the results, when evaluation should occur and how often the monitoring would be needed.</p> <p><b>Action: The NICE team to add further information on supervised exercise/physical activity, eligibility and weight gain.</b></p> <p>The PDG discussed the considerations and research recommendations.</p> <p><b>Action: The PDG to read the considerations section of previous NICE guidance, including the Overweight and Obese Children draft guidance.</b></p> <p><b>Action: The PDG to email Adrienne Cullum with any suggested wording for the recommendations, considerations, research recommendations and gaps in the evidence section.</b></p>	<p><b>Team</b></p> <p><b>The NICE Team</b></p> <p><b>The NICE Team</b></p> <p><b>PDG</b></p> <p><b>PDG</b></p>
<p><b>8. Future planning</b></p>	<p>The Chair noted that there are potentially five expert testimony slots at the next meeting in July. Experts invited to attend so far are: Professor Rebecca Puhl from Yale to speak on Stigma and Stephen Watkins a Director for Public Health in Stockport to speak on working with Health and Wellbeing boards and the new system more generally.</p> <p>Laura Sanger left the meeting at 4.10pm.</p> <p>The Chair asked the PDG if they would like to invite any further experts to give testimony to fill the gaps in the evidence. It was agreed that adverse effects of stigma would be covered in the expert testimony by Rebecca Puhl. The PDG discussed hearing from experts who could inform the group of any alternative strategies to weight management or potential adverse effects from weight loss behaviours or weight management per se. It was noted that the PDG remit is to look at lifestyle weight management programmes. Adverse effects had not been found or reported in the evidence reviews and this was an important issue to raise in the sections of the guidance on considerations, gaps and or research recommendations. It was agreed that NICE would confirm any further testimony with the PDG before circulating the agenda for the next</p>	

	meeting.  <b>Action: The NICE team to email the PDG once testimony has been confirmed. The PDG to email AC with any further suggestions for testimony and with specific questions for invited experts.</b>	<b>NICE Team/PDG</b>
<b>9. Any other business</b>	It was noted that the next meeting would be held on 9 <sup>th</sup> and 10 <sup>th</sup> July 2013. Papers would be emailed to the committee on 2 <sup>nd</sup> July.	
<b>10. Close</b>	The meeting ended at 4.25pm.	